UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/484,609	01/18/2000	Roni Korenshtein	0441.P002	9890

7590   04/28/2004

Ronald C Card
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Bouldevard 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA   90025

EXAMINER
HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	11

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>05 March 2004</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

    (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

    (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
        NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: *none*.

    Claim(s) objected to: *none*.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1 - 46*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *none*.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____.

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued in substance that

1. Applicant disagreed that Kiva suports that one or more sub-components are executed independently in an object ....server, as recited to claim 1.

2. The office action is improperly attempting to read "proxy corresponding ....the the page of data" as recited in claim 1. Applicant also stated that "the AppLogic of Kiva is an object, and is not a proxy representing a functionality of an object .... page of data".

3. the Office Action has attemped to use AppLogic of Kiva to meet the claim limitation of "executing at least one object within a single request to an application server to provide the page".

4. Yost is not directed towards "allocating and executing an object ...... sub-component".

Examiner respectfully disagree with applicant remark:

As to point 1, examiner sees that applicant did not claim "one or more sub-components are executed independent" as argued.

As to point 2, examiner did not cite the AppLogic of Kiva to be the proxy. Examiner cited proxy to be session proxy (pages 350 of 418). Each proxy session interacts with data, so it is corresponding to the sub-components.

As to point 3, examiner did not cite AppLogic of Kiva to meet the claim limitation of "executing ....the page" Examiner cited executing (execute(), p. 83 and 84 paragraph 3) at least one object within a single request to an application server (action request to be sent to Kiva Enterprise Server, p. 15) to provide the page.

As to point 4, examiner did not cite Yost for claim limitation "allocating and executing ....sub-component". Yost was only cited for teaching a container. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kiva and Yost's because Yost's container would be a good format for the spreadsheet to contain of subcomponents for easy access. It the combination of Kiva and Yost, not anyone alone, teaches all claim limitations.